

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed October 9, 2007, the Examiner noted that claims 1-18, 65 and 66 were pending, and rejected claims 1-18, 65, and 66. Claims 1-6, 9, 11-13, 15-16 and 65-66 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, new claim 67 has been added; and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1-18 and 65-67 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter is believed to have been added. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed below.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 65 and 66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1, 65 and 66 have been amended to satisfy the written description requirement. See page 31, line 9 to page 32, line 19 of the Specification for support. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 65 and 66 fully satisfy the requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection has been overcome.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-6, 10-13, 15, 65 and 66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shub et al. (U.S. Patent 6,807,530) (hereinafter "Shub") in view of Stolfo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,069,249) (hereinafter "Stolfo").

Claim 1 is directed to an e-commerce method that "warn[s] the customer that the customer does not receive the commodity when the seller's terminal does not receive a transfer-completion notification from the receiver certifying terminal in a predetermined term", (claim 1, lines 27-29), which is supported by the embodiments of the invention on pages 36-37 of the Specification.

By at least the aforementioned features recited in claim 1, the seller's terminal warns the customer that the customer did not receive the commodity when the seller's terminal does not receive a transfer-completion notification from the delivery destination point. As a result, the commodity is prevented from being left at the delivery destination point, as well as, the customer is reminded to pick up the commodity at the delivery destination point.

It is respectfully submitted that nothing was found or cited in Shub and Stolfo teaches or suggests at least the above-mentioned feature recited in claim 1.

Rather, Shub is related to a method that enables customers to remotely order goods from

a merchant and receive the goods without revealing the identity or address of the customer to the merchant or any other third party (see Shub, col. 1, lines 7-12). The customer gives an order, code numbers and the identity of the chosen payment agency to the merchant (see Shub, col. 4, lines 25-39). The merchant communicates the order number to the customer, the payment agency and to its warehouse and/or manufacturing services (see Shub, col. 2, lines 49-53 and col. 4, lines 40-61). The package is prepared by the merchant while the payment agency commands the printer to print an address label that the merchant can associate with the order but cannot otherwise read (see Shub, col. 2, lines 59-63). Once the label is attached by the merchant to the package, it is handed to the delivery company which acknowledges receipt, and rips off some foil covering the readable address (see Shub, col. 2, line 65 – col. 3, line 7). As a result, the package is then delivered to the customer (see Shub, col. 5, lines 31-63). Stated another way, Shub describes protecting the anonymity of the consumer by encrypting the mailing address of the consumer and using multiple delivery routes to deliver a package to the consumer.

Stolfo is related to a customer using a customer computer having proxy software by which the customer computer can access the Internet through a proxy computer for anonymous WWW browsing and e-commerce (see Stolfo, Abstract, col. 29, lines 25-43). The proxy computer has a physical shipping address (Depot) and when the customer makes a purchase, the proxy computer directs the depot address to ship the good to the customer address designated by the user. If the good is to be picked up at the depot address, then the proxy computer is informed when the good is picked up (see Stolfo, col. 31, lines 39-52).

In claim 1, however, "the seller's terminal" ... "*warn[s] the customer* that the customer does not receive the commodity when the seller's terminal does not receive a transfer-completion notification from the receiver certifying terminal at a predetermined term". Neither Shub nor Stolfo, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest such a feature as recited in claim 1. Shub does not teach or suggest such a feature since Shub is merely concerned with encrypting the delivery address of the consumer to deliver the goods using various delivery routes (e.g. clearing houses) and does not *warn the customer* that the customer has not received the commodity when the seller does not receive delivery confirmation at a certain time. Further, Stolfo does not teach or suggest such a feature since Stolfo is merely concerned with notifying the proxy terminal when the good is picked up and does not *warn the customer* that the customer does not receive the commodity when the seller's terminal does not receive a transfer-completion notification.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Shub and Stolfo in light of the above-mentioned discussion.

Amended claims 65 and 66 emphasize a similar feature as recited in claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 65 and 66 are patentable over Shub and Stolfo, taken alone or in combination thereof, for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

The dependent claims 2-6, 10-13 and 15 are also patentable over Shub and Stolfo, taken alone or in combination thereof, for at least the same reasons as their base claim 1.

At pages 12-14 of the Office Action, claims 7-9, 14 and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the various combination of Shub et al. (U.S. Patent 6,807,530), Stolfo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,069,249), Shkedy (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,972), Tsukuda (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,170), O'Leary et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,609,113), and Quinlan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,748,365).

The dependent claims 7-9, 14 and 16-18 are patentable over Shub et al. and Stolfo et al. for at least the same reasons as their base claim 1. Further, nothing was found or cited in Shkedy, Tsukuda, O'Leary et al., and Quinlan et al. that cures the deficiencies of Shub et al. and Stolfo et al. as set forth above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are also patentable over Shub et al., Stolfo et al., Shkedy, Tsukuda, O'Leary et al., and Quinlan et al., taken alone or in combination thereof.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection has been overcome.

New Claim

New claim 67 has been added to recite:

67. (New) A method, comprising:
- transmitting, from a seller, a good to a delivery destination after receiving an anonymous order from a customer;
 - transferring the good to the customer, via the delivery destination, when the delivery destination matches first customer verification information received from the customer with second customer verification information received from the seller; and
 - notifying the customer that the customer did not pick up the good on a day of pick up when the seller does not receive a transfer-completion notification from the delivery destination during a pick-up time window.

It is respectfully submitted that the above-mentioned features of new claim 67 are not taught or suggested in the references, taken alone or in combination thereof. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that new claim 67 is patentable over the references.

Summary

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: February 11, 2008

By: /Sheetal S. Patel/
Sheetal S. Patel
Registration No. 59,326

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501